DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 847 SP 033 582

AUTHOR Friedman, Malcolm
TITLE Empowering Staff: Evaluation of First Year Program in Preparing Special Populations for Leadership Roles in Special Education.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education (16th, Houston, TX, November 21-26, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Development; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Leadership Training; Mentors; *Minority Groups; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Special Education; *Supervisory Training; *Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS Long Island University NY; Staff Empowerment

ABSTRACT

The Special Education Leadership Program began at the Brooklyn Center of Long Island University in 1991. The project was designed to identify, train, and mentor 19 skilled teachers and clinicians in special education who aspired to supervisory and administrative careers. About 70 percent of the target population consisted of persons from traditionally underrepresented populations in educational administration. The project provides for academic study, mentoring, and seminars, and completion of a 36-credit curriculum leading to New York State certification as school district administrator and a professional diploma. Students gain competency in leadership, management, curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, student personnel, in-district relationships, outside professional organizations, and specialized administrative areas. Project staff includes a director who coordinates and evaluates all activities, two on-site faculty trainers, and two mentors. Because the mentors are female minority group members who filled high level administrative positions, they are appropriate role models. Evaluation of the project's first year indicates that it was successful. The mentoring component was a worthwhile adjunct to on-campus work, providing an arena for anticipatory socialization in the field setting. The Special Education Leadership Preparation Program Leadership Scholars' Questionnaire is appended. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343847

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY

BROOKLYN CAMPUS

EMPOWERING STAFF:
EVALUATION OF FIRST YEAR PROGRAM
IN PREPARING SPECIAL POPULATIONS
FOR LEADERSHIP ROLES IN
SPECIAL EDUCATION

by

Malcolm Friedman Ph.D
Long Island University
Brooklyn, New York

Paper Presented At The
National Council of States On Inservice Education Conference
Houston, Texas
November, 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Friedman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP033582

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

1. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT..... 1

1.1 Overview.....1

1.2 Objections.....1

1.3 Design.....2

1.3.1 Academic component.....2

1.3.2 Master Supervisor/Mentor Component.....3

*2. EVALUATION DESIGN (1990-91).....4

3. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE.....5

4. INITIAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR PARTICIPANTS (Fall, 1990)...5

5. INITIAL FINDINGS (Fall, 1990).....6

6. PROCEDURES/END-OF-YEAR EVALUATION.....10

7. END-OF-YEAR FINDINGS.....10

8. CONCLUSIONS.....16

9. RECOMMENDATIONS.....17

APPENDIX

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

REFERENCES

*The evaluation study was designed and conducted by Dr. Carol Kazlow, Professor of Education, Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus

1. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

1.1 Overview

The Special Education Leadership Program (1990-1991), funded through a grant from the United States Department of Education, was initiated at the Brooklyn Center of Long Island University in the Fall of 1991. The project was designed to identify, train and mentor nineteen skilled teachers and clinicians in special education who aspire to supervisory/administrative careers. At least 70% of the target population consists of persons from traditionally underrepresented populations in educational administration.

The project provides for an academic program of study, completion of thirty-six credit curriculum leading to New York State Certification as School District Administrator and a Professional Diploma and non-traditional components such as mentoring and seminar experiences.

The project staff consists of a part-time project director, who is responsible for the overall coordination and evaluation of project activities. In addition, there are two on-site faculty trainers who assist the project director. Two mentors, former New York City supervisors with experience working with teachers at the school and at the district level in capacities ranging from principal to superintendent, provide assistance to the students in a variety of ways. The mentors are appropriate role models for the project since they are female minority group members who filled high level administrative positions in the New York City school system. Each mentor is expected to make on-site visits to the students' schools and to be available to the students on an as-needed basis. Mentors through their close contact with each student, are part of the evaluation effort. In addition, the project has a part-time administrative assistant and a project evaluator.

1.2 Objectives

Objective 1

To identify nineteen skilled teachers and clinicians in special education who will receive training for a career as supervisor of special education.

Objective 2

To provide a mentor component for selected participants. Mentors will work with students prior to and during course matriculation serving as role models and counselors.

Objective 3

To increase the number of supervisors of special education from traditionally underrepresented groups.

Objective 4

To foster a group process approach in supervisory training through a mentor conferencing model which brings together mentors, participants and university trainers. This approach enhances the academic training component.

Objective 5

To acquaint and guide participants through the process of New York State certification and New York City licensure for supervisory positions in special education.

Objective 6

To disseminate this training model to other colleges and universities participating in supervisory pre-service development programs.

1.3 Design

1.3.1 Academic component:

The nineteen special education teachers and clinicians, selected as Leadership Scholars in Special Education, are enrolled in the Professional Diploma Program, Administration/School District Administration at Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus.

In order to ensure that program participants are thoroughly prepared in regard to the knowledge, abilities, attitudes and skills necessary for a beginning supervisor of special education, a series of competencies is delineated. These serve as a base for course work, workshops and other programmatic activities.

The competencies are organized within eight (8) areas to include:

1. Leadership
2. Management
3. Curriculum and Instruction
4. Staff Personnel
5. Student Personnel
6. In-District Relationships
7. Outside Professional Organizations
8. Specialized Administrative Area

Course content is based on the administrative/supervisory competencies listed above. Course curriculum is modified to meet special needs of participants to include current research in the field of special education/administration. Wherever possible, Leadership Scholars take an active role in the curriculum modification process.

Leadership Scholars move as a cohort through the course of study ensuring a cohesiveness and similarity of curriculum experience for all participants. Instructors are specially selected for classes, to include experienced practitioners as well as theoreticians. Special care is taken, in the selection of university faculty , to recruit those who have had recent field based experience and keep current regarding research in special education/supervision.

To enhance the training provided and to afford participants direct access to top-level policy makers and experts in their field, specialists from the Division of Special Education, and community groups such as Advocates for Children are utilized as guest speakers in courses and for seminars.

1.3.2 Master Supervisor/Mentor Model

Utilizing the knowledge, skill and understanding of experienced retired supervisors of special education, the project provides participants with content materials, emotional support and encouragement. Through this process personal adequacy, professional competence, confidence, and self-assurance are built.

Each project participant (Leadership Scholar) is assigned to a Master Supervisor/Mentor. Approximately ten Leadership Scholars are assigned to each of two Master Supervisor/Mentors and they meet on a regularly scheduled basis. Meetings are held at Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus or at a centralized location for a two-hour period, 4:00-6:00 p.m. on days when course work is not scheduled. Participants have an opportunity to:

Share and express concerns, with Master Supervisor/Mentor, other participants, and On-Site Faculty Trainers.

Engage in problem-solving activities and exchange methods, materials, techniques, resources.

Learn a variety of "how-to's - - time-tested ways that have enabled seasoned supervisors to improve instruction".

Receive guidance regarding the process related to becoming a supervisor (licensure and certification).

Participate in sessions concerning interview techniques and job placement.

In addition to scheduled meetings, Master Supervisor/Mentors are available by telephone and/or in-person to talk with participants on a more personal, individual basis.

Two faculty members, (On-Site Faculty Trainers) from Long Island University, supervise the Master Supervisor/Mentors and participate in each of the group meetings. Faculty trainers integrate classroom and field-based experiences.

2. EVALUATION DESIGN (1990-91)

This evaluation is both formative and summative. The formative aspect calls for an ongoing analysis of the program's direction and progress. The evaluator discussed her observations periodically with the Project Director and the Project Staff including the teaching faculty. This aspect of the evaluation is designed to enable the director and his staff to reinforce project strengths and overcome problems.

The summative aspect is designed to help assess project impact on the student and to assess the degree to which project objectives have been met. The evaluation of this aspect of the project consists of reviewing course completion rates and student academic outcomes. In addition, students completed an initial instrument at the beginning of the project year and a final instrument at the end of the first year Mentors completed an evaluation form for each student they had contact with and faculty were asked to complete a questionnaire for the course they taught. These instruments provided the data for this aspect of the evaluation.

Controls are weak, as no comparison groups are available. Therefore, this study should be viewed as a case study. The findings therefore are suggestive, as this group may or may not be representative of other similar students.

3. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

The students in the sample are primarily female (N=14) with only four males and range in age from 32 to 57 with a mean age of 40. There was virtually no difference in the mean age of the males as compared to the females. The ethnic composition of the group is African American (N=8), Non Hispanic White (N=5), Hispanic (N=3), Asian (N=1), Native American (N=1), with one student checking the category "other". All respondents reported having at least a Master's degree and one had a professional diploma.

The average number of years of paid teaching experience was 11.4, and ranged from 6 to 20 years. Only four students indicated no experience in special education. The fifteen who do have experience as special education teachers had an average of 8.1 years of experience. It is apparent that given the average age of the group, many came to teaching later in life. The group is therefore non-traditional in terms of their status characteristics-sex, age, and ethnicity.

When asked to describe the jobs they currently hold, ten described themselves as classroom teachers in elementary, middle school or high school. The remainder occupy a wide variety of school positions including psychologist, attendance coordinator, educational evaluator, school social worker, crisis intervention teacher and teacher trainer.

4. INITIAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR PARTICIPANTS (Fall, 1990)

On November 12, 1990 an initial survey instrument was distributed to the Leadership Scholars during their regular class session. Provision was made for anonymity and confidentiality was assured. Students were instructed to complete the questionnaire and return it to the Project Director the following week. Nineteen completed questionnaires were returned and coded.

The initial questionnaire consists of a number of items designed to obtain demographic data and information related to the project's objectives as specified in the proposal. In addition, questions were included which enabled the evaluator to measure: reasons for applying, clarity of program objectives, students' self-evaluation of their confidence as leaders and as students, perceived level of knowledge in special education and educational research and estimations of their confidence in their ability to complete the program. Some of this information will provide a base-line to compare with end-of year results. Students were also asked to rank a number of professional occupational positions, presumably related to the goals of the program. In this way, an initial measure of professional goals was obtained.

A number of items were included to tap the degree to which this group of students is currently engaged in professional activities in either special education or educational administration. Students were also asked if they would have gone on to pursue advanced study in this area at Long Island University or at some other institution were it not for the grant.

The last section of the instrument asks the student to evaluate a number of programs services at the University or as part of the program. The survey instrument is included in the appendix.

5. INITIAL FINDINGS (Fall, 1990)

5.1 Reasons for applying

Students were asked to describe their reasons for applying to the program. Given a list of possible choices and the instruction to check "up to three reasons that were most significant", the responses were as follows: seventeen students checked "the opportunity to advance my career." Ten students checked "the availability of scholarships", nine students agreed to "the unique programmatic aspects of this project" and "the ability to complete the program in only two years". Six checked, "the reputation of the special education program at Long Island University" and 2 checked "the location of the school".

5.2 Degree of Confidence Regarding Abilities

Table 1 describes the response pattern to the items in question 9 which asked the student to record a response that reflects the degree to which they feel confident or clear when thinking about the content of the item. The object of this series of questions is to enable us to determine where the student started from with respect to various program objectives so that we can determine if the student experiences growth when they respond to the same item later on.

For the most part, the students seem to be very confident in their ability as leaders; they believe they have expertise in special education; they are confident in their ability to do well and to complete the program. There was some lack of clarity on their part concerning initial understanding of the program as well as some lack of clarity with reference to the concept of mentoring. Only two students said they were very confident in their ability to understand educational research. This is probably one of the areas that will need to be emphasized in the program.

Student response to several items designed to tap the degree to which they are actively engaged in "professional" activities confirm this supposition. For example, when asked if they currently subscribe to a journal or journals

in the field of special education, twelve said "no". The seven who said "yes" were asked to specify the name of the journal. Not one of the seven responses was a journal in special education. Instead they wrote in periodicals like Psychology Today, Instructor, or Teacher Magazine. These students do not subscribe to periodicals in the field of special education. It is not a part of their behavioral repertoire. When asked if they read journals in Special Education or educational administration, eleven said "no". Of those who said "yes" several were able to indicate appropriate journals in one of the two specialty areas. The students who did read were then asked how frequently they read these journals. Three of the six who read indicated that they did so "ten to twelve times a year". The remaining three read journals between three and nine times a year. No one in this group reads weekly.

Only four of the nineteen members of the cohort said they belong to a professional association in the field of special education. 12 of the 19 said they had attended professional conferences in the field of Special Education. This was not, confirmed by the students for when they specified the conference attended, the great majority referred to work-related conferences in their school district.

Table 1

Student Responses to Items Related to Feelings of Confidence in Their Abilities

Item	Response				
	very positive	somewhat positive	somewhat negative	very negative	T
a. When you first heard about this program, how clear were you concerning the objectives of the program?	4	13	2	0	19
b. At the present time, how clear are you concerning the concept of mentoring?	4	14	0	0	18
c. At the present time, how confident are you in your ability as a leader?	11	7	0	0	18
d. At the present time, how confident do you feel concerning your level of knowledge in the area of special education?	9	8	2	0	19
e. At the present time, how confident are you when it comes to understanding educational research?	2	13	4	0	19
f. At the present time, how confident do you feel about your ability to do well in this program?	10	9	0	0	19
g. At the present time, how confident are you that you will complete this program?	13	4	2	0	19

5.3 Career Goals/Program Objectives

The initial instrument attempted to determine participants' career goals to see if their goals reflected the objectives of the program and of the grant. Table 2 summarizes students' responses to the instructions "upon completion of this program, if you had your choice of jobs, which would you choose". Students were asked to rank their choices. They were allowed to choose as many as they liked. Only three students wrote in a career objective that was not listed. They were as follows: superintendent, Chancellor of New York City Public Schools and clinical supervisor.

Of the choices listed, the most frequently cited in order of desirability to the student were special education supervisor, supervisor of special education in a district office, and assistant principal. These choices indeed reflect the objectives of the program.

Table 2

Occupational Goals

Goal	Choice						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Educational Evaluator	1	0	0	0	0	2	0
Resource Room Teacher	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Special Ed. Supervisor	6	4	2	1	3	0	0
Assistant Principal	1	7	4	6	0	0	0
Principal	2	2	6	3	0	0	0
Supervisor of S.E. in a District Office	7	3	3	2	0	0	0
Curriculum Specialist	0	2	2	0	3	1	0

5.4 Pursuit of Career Goals

Because this proposal was partially designed to attract a non-traditional population into the field of special education administration, the evaluator included an item addressing this objective (Question 15). Students were asked if they would have pursued an advanced degree in educational administration were it not for the program. Most (N=15) said they would have, only 1 said "no", and 3 did not know. However, when asked if they would have been attending Long Island University, were it not for the program only 2 responded affirmatively, 6 said "no" and 11 said they did not know.

5.5 Program Services

The last item on the pre-test survey instrument, (see Table 3) consisted of an array of "services" to be rated on a scale of A to F by the student. This information is part of the formative evaluation and can be used to modify the program as it evolves.

At this early stage in the implementation of the project students were not familiar enough with various university support services, such as the library, to evaluate them. Yet, they did seem to have developed positive attitudes toward the faculty, the project staff, their peers and the seminars.

Table 3

Student Initial Rating of Program Services

Service	Rating					
	A	B	C	D	F	Don't Know
1. Library	1	3	2	0	0	12
2. Cafeteria	0	0	1	1	0	17
3. Transportation	4	4	2	1	0	7
4. Parking	1	1	4	5	2	5
5. Registration Procedures	7	4	5	1	1	1
6. Attitude of Faculty	10	7	0	0	0	0
7. Attitude of Project Staff	10	6	0	0	0	3
8. Seminars	8	6	2	1	0	2
9. Level of knowledge of my peers in the program	5	10	2	1	0	1
10. Accessibility of Faculty	8	6	0	0	1	4
11. Accessibility of Mentors	4	5	1	0	0	9
12. Accessibility of Project Director	7	6	0	0	0	6

6. PROCEDURES/END OF YEAR EVALUATION

The first year of the Long Island University Special Education Leadership Program ended in June, 1991. At that time, sixteen students had completed fifteen credits of course work including two six credit foundations courses which were given over the course of the fall and spring semesters and a three credit course which they took during the month of June. All students had been visited at their work site by their mentor at least twice.

In order to complete this phase of the evaluation, a series of questionnaires were administered. Fifteen students (with the exception of one who was unavailable) completed the end of year instrument. In addition, the two program mentors completed an individual evaluation form for each student as well as an overall assessment and evaluation of their role as mentors. Finally, faculty received a student evaluation form to complete.

7. END OF YEAR FINDINGS

7.1 Mentor Evaluation

Mentors were asked to define their role in this project. Both mentors see themselves as counselors and as role models. Their objectives are to establish and maintain rapport with the scholars; to provide emotional and professional support; to provide personal consultation through meetings and school visitations; to provide individual assistance through one-on-one meetings and telephone contacts on an as needed basis and to evaluate progress in gaining supervisory and administrative skills. In addition to visiting each student on site, mentors maintained telephone contact and were available to see students at the seminars. All students, without exception, were assessed as superior by these mentors.

Each student was evaluated on a scale with response categories ranging from excellent to poor. Twelve abilities were evaluated. They included: communication skills, knowledge of special education, attitude toward students, enthusiasm, willingness to accept direction, receptivity to new ideas, ability to inspire confidence, leadership skills, professional knowledge, understanding of the role expectations of a school supervisor, ability to fill the role expectations of a school supervisor and reliability. Mentors were also asked to give an overall evaluation of the student, based on their estimate of the student's leadership potential.

The final item asked the mentor to provide specific recommendations for each student's professional growth. Without a single exception all sixteen students received an "excellent" evaluation for each of the twelve items

specified and all were given an overall rating of "A". The mentors seem to have very high regard for the capabilities and potential of this group. The only recommendations made, and these were consistent too, concerned the need to provide students with exposure to as many supervisory experiences as possible including visits to other schools and/or districts.

7.2 Faculty Evaluation

Faculty were asked to rate various aspects of the program. The following items were rated: student's academic ability, attitude toward the course, receptivity to new ideas, attendance, availability and helpfulness of the Project Director, student's understanding of course expectations, willingness to comply with course expectations, their attitudes towards each other and the degree to which the faculty member believes the course content is important in the education of a future supervisor. The response options were excellent, fair, poor and does not apply. Most items were rated "excellent".

The areas which need strengthening deal with student's academic ability, specifically writing skills, their lack of understanding of course expectations and problems with willingness to comply with expectations. It seems that standard expectations were sometimes perceived as being overwhelming. These expectations include, for example, such things as retrieving journal articles from the library and reading text materials. This older, experienced group of teachers tended to initially resist the rigors of academia.

Attendance at seminars and workshops was the kind of professional activity they were accustomed to and not time-consuming, disciplined study. This was particularly evident in the research component of the foundations core where many students were initially unable to select a problem and retrieve several research studies on that problem. This assignment frustrated several of the students who were never able to adequately deal with the task. In the future, explicit behaviors associated with the role of graduate student must be specified including estimates of what is appropriate in terms of number of hours of study per week.

7.3 End of Year Survey Instrument for Participants (May, 1991)

On May 20, 1991 the Leadership Scholars completed an end of year survey instrument. Fifteen of the original nineteen pre-tested students completed questionnaires. Two of the students dropped out early in the fall, one took a leave of absence for personal reasons and one student was not present.

7.3.1 Degree of Confidence/Program Services

Table 4 consists of student responses to items related to feelings of confidence in their abilities. The items were, for the most part, identical to those that were in the initial survey instrument (see Table 1). As the students were initially very positive in terms of their confidence, little change occurred. There was some increase in clarity concerning the objectives of the program. Table 5 represents student ratings of program services at the end of the project year. Initial high evaluations of program components (see Table 3) were maintained. The problem areas, as perceived by this group, had to do with the library and parking facilities.

Table 4

Student Responses to Items Related to Feelings of Confidence in Their Abilities
(End -Of-Year Findings)

	very positive	somewhat positive	somewhat negative	very negative
a. How clear are you concerning the objectives of the program?	6	7	2	0
b. At the present time, how clear are you concerning the concept of mentoring?	7	4	4	0
c. At the present time, how confident are you in your ability as a leader?	9	6	0	0
d. At the present time, how confident do you feel concerning your level of knowledge in the area of special education?	9	5	1	0
e. At the present time, how confident are you when it comes to understanding educational research?	3	11	1	0
f. At the present time, how confident do you feel about your ability to do well in this program?	10	5	0	0
g. At the present time, how confident are you that you will complete this program?	12	2	0	1

Table 5

Student End of Year Rating of Program Services

	Service	Rating					
		A	B	C	D	F	Don't Know
a.	Library	1	4	5	2	1	2
b.	Cafeteria	0	2	1	1	0	12
c.	Transportation	3	6	1	1	1	4
d.	Parking	0	2	3	4	1	4
e.	Registration Procedures	5	5	3	1	0	1
f.	Attitude of faculty	5	7	3	0	0	0
g.	Ability of faculty	8	5	2	0	0	0
h.	Attitude of Project Staff	7	4	3	0	0	1
i.	Seminars	6	5	1	2	1	0
j.	The level of knowledge of my peers in the program	3	2	0	0	0	1
k.	Accessibility of faculty	3	7	3	0	0	2
l.	Accessibility of mentors	6	7	2	0	0	0
m.	Quality of mentoring	6	4	3	1	0	0
n.	Accessibility of Project Director	5	6	2	1	0	1
o.	Quality of the program overall	5	8	2	0	0	1

7.3.2 Course Content/Delivery

The last part of the student evaluation consisted of questions designed to enable students to provide data concerning course content and delivery. Table 6 summarizes the findings which, on the whole, are overwhelmingly positive. For each of the foundations courses students were asked if the level of instruction was appropriate. Of the 60 possible responses only one student stated that the level of the course was inappropriate and one was unsure. Only two students felt assignments were not meaningful in terms of meeting course objectives. The vast majority (49 out of 60) found the course objectives clear. There was virtual consensus that they had grown intellectually as a result of exposure to the body of knowledge presented in each course.

Table 6

Students' Responses to Questions Related to Courses

Question	Response Options		
	Yes	No	Unsure
1. Was the level of instruction appropriate?	52	1	7
2. Were the assignments meaningful in terms of meeting course objectives?	51	2	7
3. Were the course objectives clear to you?	49	4	6
4. Do you feel you grew intellectually as a result of exposure to this body of knowledge?	55	1	4

When asked to comment on the most positive aspects of the program, most comments were directed toward the outstanding faculty. They mentioned their patience, friendliness, and helpfulness. They enjoyed the seminars and were particularly satisfied with the many opportunities offered to meet outstanding professionals in the field. Several students pointed to the mentoring component as being especially helpful to them.

Table 7

Student Evaluation of Courses

Item	Ratings				
	A	B	C	D	F
1. Overall rating of courses	10	5	0	0	0
2. Overall rating of instruction	11	4	0	0	0
3. Overall rating of Students' own work	11	4	0	0	0
4. Evaluation of the importance of course content for professional growth	6	7	2	0	0

Table 8

Evaluation of Seminars

Category	Number
Very worthwhile	53
Somewhat worthwhile	52
Not very worthwhile	15
Worthless	0

Another consequence of the project that yielded positive results was the development of a cohesive peer group within the cohort. These students became a team and developed strong collegial ties to one another. Over and over again, students indicated in one way or another that this was one of the most positive outcomes of the project. It can probably be perceived as a positive latent function of having the group move along through their course work as a team. For teachers this is an opportunity to share what is not often built into their professional work day. Students provided each other with both emotional and academic support. This can probably be extended by the explicit formation of cooperative learning groups within the class. Such groups could have great utility especially when attempting to master difficult concepts and for problem solving.

When asked to specify problematic aspects of the program the modal responses had to do with not enough time, the work loads, and financial problems. Perhaps an orientation day can be introduced during the next cycle and workshops related to financial aid, study skills, and time management can be incorporated into this day. In this way many problems can be overcome initially.

In Table 7 students' evaluation of courses are summarized. Again, courses were rated very highly with about two thirds of the ratings in the "A" category and one third in the "B". There was virtually no consistent problem with overall course ratings, or quality of instruction. Students generally gave their own work high ratings as well. The only area that might need to be attended to by the project staff, although it is not extremely problematic, has to do with students understanding the significance of course content for professional growth. Faculty should be aware that the students new to the discipline may not understand the rationale for a particular course of study.

The last table (8) reports student response to the professional seminars. Each speaker (seminar) was evaluated. 88% of the items rated on this scale were deemed to be worthwhile. Again, this important aspect of the program, along with the course work, and the mentoring, received favorable evaluations.

8. CONCLUSIONS

The first year of the Special Education Leadership Preparation Program at Long Island University, designed to train personnel, particularly those from traditionally underrepresented groups, for careers as supervisors of special education, can be reviewed as a successful first effort. To date, fifteen students from the target group have succeeded in completing the first year of the two year program. The

recruitment effort resulted in selecting an appropriate group. This cohort completed all course work and met university standards. The mentoring component has proven to be worthwhile adjunct to traditional on-campus work and provides an arena for anticipatory socialization in the field setting. The Project Director and his staff are to be commended for selecting outstanding faculty and for providing seminars which have extended the knowledge of the students into formerly uninvestigated areas.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 Mentors should attempt to further individualize the services they offer to each student rather than treating them as a category. Within a heterogeneous group such as this one, one would expect to find varying areas of strength as well as varying needs among the population. In the future, mentors should attempt to focus on specifying one area in need of strengthening at the beginning of their relationship, and monitoring the students' progress. The mentor should be expected to document this as well. Without this information, one cannot determine if there has been behavioral changes and professional growth in the work setting.

9.2 Since financial concerns are a problem for these students, it would be helpful to provide them with any available information on financial aid. This would be practical and could relieve the stress many students feel.

9.3 Many of the students have been away from a university setting for a long time. Their expectations may be unrealistic. There were many comments concerning lack of time and heavy workloads. However, the course expectation were no more than that which is expected of other graduate students in similar programs. In the future, expectations should be clearly specified at the outset of the program. Students should know they will be required to read extensively and do research in a library setting. They cannot expect to fulfill all their requirements during the hours allotted for attending courses. If a student has extraordinary external obligations, he/she should take this into consideration before making the commitment to participate in the program. It is recommended that the orientation be extended to include workshops on library utilization, organization of time, and financial aid options.

9.4 It might be functional to divide each group into teams for the purpose of creating study groups. These groups could work together in and out of class on projects and problem solving. They could get together as a group with faculty for tutorials when necessary. The concept of cooperative learning is what is being suggested here.

APPENDIX

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
BROOKLYN CAMPUS
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

November 12, 1990

Dear Leadership Scholar,

Welcome to Long Island University! As you know, my responsibility as the evaluator of this program is to obtain information from you, the faculty mentors and project administrators so that we can determine the degree to which the project has been implemented and the extent to which objectives have been accomplished.

In order to do this, you will be asked to complete several questionnaires over the next few years. I will also be speaking with each of you from time to time. Of course your responses will be confidential. At no time will the Project Administrators, mentors or faculty be aware of what any individual scholar says.

I am asking you to formulate a code number, which you will place in the appropriate space on the first page of this questionnaire. This code will be used to match future questionnaires to this one so that change can be noted. The code number will contain seven digits. The first two digits represent the month in which you were born. If you were born in January, you would place a 0 1 in the first two spaces. If it were November, your code would be 1 1. The next two spaces stand for the date of the month you were born. So, if it were January 23, you put a 23 in spaces three and four of the code. The last three spaces of the code are for the last three digits of your social security number. So, if your date of birth was September 11, 1950 and your social security number is 084-34-2237 your code is:

0 9 1 1 2 3 7

Please be careful with this because it is the only way we have to match up your questionnaires.

I want to thank you, in advance, for your cooperation. I look forward to a productive and successful year.

Sincerely,

Carole Kazlow, Ph.D.
Project Evaluator

CK:laf

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
BROOKLYN CAMPUS
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Administration and Leadership

Special Education Leadership Preparation Program

Leadership Scholars' Questionnaire

November 12, 1990

CODE NUMBER __ __ - __ __ - __ __ __

This questionnaire contains a number of items about you and your attitudes toward the program. For each, put a check in the appropriate space or provide the information requested.

1. Sex: _____M _____F

2. Age: _____

3. Ethnic Background:
   _____ Hispanic
   _____ African American
   _____ Non-Hispanic White
   _____ Oriental
   _____ Other (specify)

4. Highest Degree Obtained:
   _____ Bachelor's
   _____ Master's
   _____ Professional Diploma
   _____ Ph.D.
   _____ Other (specify)

5. Total number of years of paid teaching experience
   _____

6. Total number of years as a special education teacher
   _____

7. Please describe the job you currently hold. (For example, you may be a resource room teacher in an elementary school or a special education teacher at the high school level.)

   _____

   _____

   _____

8. There are a number of reasons why you might have applied for this program. Check up to <u>three</u> reasons that were most significant to you.

_____ The opportunity to advance my career

_____ The availability of scholarships

_____ The location of the school

_____ The reputation of the Special Education Program at Long Island University

_____ The unique programmatic aspects of this project

_____ The ability to complete the program in only two years

9. Each of the items in Question 9 requires that you record a response that tells us the degree to which you feel positive or negative when thinking about the question. Read each part and check the space that reflects how you feel now.

	very positive	somewhat positive	somewhat negative	very negative
a. When you <u>first</u> heard about this program, how <u>clear</u> were you concerning the objectives of the program?	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. At the present time, how <u>clear</u> are you concerning the concept of mentoring?	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. At the present time, how <u>confident</u> are you in your ability as a leader?	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. At the present time, how <u>confident</u> do you feel concerning your level of knowledge in the area of special education?	_____	_____	_____	_____

e. At the present time, how <u>confident</u> are you when it comes to understanding educational research? _____ _____ _____ _____

f. At the present time, how <u>confident</u> do you feel about your ability to do well in this program? _____ _____ _____ _____

g. At the present time, how <u>confident</u> are you that you will complete this program? _____ _____ _____ _____

10. Upon completion of this program, if you had your choice of jobs, which would you choose? (Put a "1" next to your first choice, a "2" next to your second and so on. You may choose as many as you like.)

_____ educational evaluator

_____ resource room teacher

_____ special education supervisor

_____ assistant principal

_____ principal

_____ supervisor of special education in a district office

_____ curriculum specialist in a district office

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

11. Do you currently subscribe to a journal or journals in the field of special education? _____Yes _____No

If "Yes" specify the name of the journal(s).

_____

_____

_____

12. Do you read journals in special education or educational administration? _____Yes _____No

If your answer to item 12 was "Yes," specify the name(s) of the journal(s) you read.

_____

_____

_____

How frequently do you read these journals?

_____ once or twice a year

_____ three to five times a year

_____ six to nine times a year

_____ ten to twelve times a year

_____ weekly

13. Do you belong to any professional associations in the field of special education? _____Yes _____No

If "Yes," please specify the name of the organization(s).

_____

_____

_____

14. Have you ever attended a professional conference in special education? _____Yes _____No

If "Yes," please specify which conference or conferences and when attended.

_____

_____

_____

15. If it were not for this program, would you have pursued an advanced degree in educational administration?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I don't know

16. If it were not for this program, would you be attending Long Island University?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I don't know

17. On a scale of A (excellent) to F (failing), how would you rate each of the following Long Island University services:

	A	B	C	D	F	Don't Know
a. Library	___	___	___	___	___	___
b. Cafeteria	___	___	___	___	___	___
c. Transportation	___	___	___	___	___	___
d. Parking	___	___	___	___	___	___
e. Registration Procedures	___	___	___	___	___	___
f. Attitude of faculty	___	___	___	___	___	___
g. Attitude of Project Staff	___	___	___	___	___	___
h. Seminars	___	___	___	___	___	___
i. The level of knowledge of my peers in the program	___	___	___	___	___	___
j. Accessibility of faculty	___	___	___	___	___	___
k. Accessibility of mentors	___	___	___	___	___	___
l. Accessibility of Project Director	___	___	___	___	___	___

REFERENCES

Almanza, H.P., & Mosley, W.J. (1980). Curriculum adaptations and modifications for culturally diverse handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 46, 608-614.

Anderson, E. (1987). Definitions of Mentoring. Unpublished manuscript.

Anderson, E. and Shannon, A. (1988). Toward a conceptualization of mentoring. Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (1), 38-42.

Association for Cross-Cultural Education and Social Studies, Inc. (1981). Bilingual special education personnel preparation national task oriented seminar. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 229 893).

Baca, L. (1980). Policy options for insuring the delivery of an appropriate education to handicapped children who are of limited English proficiency. Washington, DC: Office of Special Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 199 963).

Baca, L., & Bransford, J. (1981). Meeting the needs of the bilingual handicapped child. Momentum, 12, 26-29, 49-51.

Baca, L. & Chinn, P. (1982). Coming to grips with cultural diversity. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 2 (4), 33-45.

Bernal, E.M. (1983). Trends in bilingual special education. Learning Disability Quarterly, 6, 424-431.

Bransford, L., Baca, L., & Lane, K. (1973). Cultural diversity and the exceptional child. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Brookover, Wilbur B. (1977). A Study of Elementary School Social System and School Outcomes. East Lansing: Michigan State University Center for Urban Affairs.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York, Author.

Cegelka, P.T. & Prehm, H.J. (1979) Teacher education and special education. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Chinn, P.C. (1979). The exceptional minority child: Issues and some answers. Exceptional Children, 45, 523-536.

Cline, D. & Fagen, S. (Eds.). (1979). A Listing of Alternative Training Outcomes for Instructional Personnel Engaged in the Education of the Handicapped. Bloomington, IN: National Inservice Network.

Denemark, G., & Nutter, N. (1980). The case for extended programs of initial teacher preparation. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Fradd, S. & Hallman, C.L. (1983). Implications of psychological and educational research for assessment and instruction of culturally and linguistically different students. Learning Disability Quarterly, 6, 468-478.

Fuchigami, R.Y. (1980). Teacher education for culturally diverse exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 46, 634-641.

Howsam, R.B., Corrigan, D.C., Denemark, G.W., & Nash, R.J. (1976). Educating a profession. Report of the AACTE Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Milne, N.M. (1982). Issues and concerns related to the education of exceptional bilingual students. In C.H. Thomas & J.L. Thomas (Eds.) Bilingual special education resource guide. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx, 3-10.

National Information Center for Children and Youth with Handicaps. (1987). Minority Issues in Special Education: A Portrait of the Future.

New York State Education Department (March, 1986). Educating Children with Handicapping Conditions in New York State, 1987-89.

New York State Education Department (February, 1984). Increasing Minority Access to the Licensed Professions.

Ortiz, A.A., & Yates, J.R. (1983). Incidence of exceptionality among Hispanics: Implications for manpower planning. National Association for Bilingual Education Journal, 7, 41-53.

Plata, M. & Santos, S.L. (1981). Bilingual special education: A challenge for the future. Teaching Exceptional Children, 14, 99-100.

Poplin, M.S., & Wright, P. (1983). The concept of cultural pluralism: Issues in special education. Learning Disability Quarterly, 6, 367-371.

Prieto, A.G., Rueda, R.S., & Rodrigues, R.F. (1981). Teaching competencies for bilingual/multicultural exceptional children. Teacher Education and Special Education, 4 (4), 35-39.

Rueda, R.S., Rodriquez, R.F., & Prieto, A.G. (1981). Teachers' perceptions of competencies for instructing bilingual/ multicultural exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 48, 268-270.

Salend, S.J. & Fradd, S. (1985). Certification and training programs for bilingual special education. Teacher Education and Special Education, 8, 198-202.

School Leadership Preparation: A Preface for Action: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC, 1988.

Smith-Davis, J., Morsink, C., & Wheatley, F.W. (1984). The Baseline Book: Quality in Personnel Preparation for Education of the Handicapped. Vienna, VA: Dissemin/Action.

U.S. Department of Education (1988). Tenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act.

Westling, D.L., Koorland, M.A., & Rose, T.L. (1981). Characteristics of superior and average special education teachers. Exceptional Children, 47 (5), 357, 364.

Yates, J.R. (1982). Teacher training associated with serving bilingual exceptional students. Teacher Education and Special Education, 5, 61-68.